



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,983	03/15/2004	G. Glenn Henry	CNTR.2073	1410
23669 7590 07/23/2009 HUFFMAN LAW GROUP, P.C. 1900 MESA AVE. COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80906				
EXAMINER TRAORE, FATOUMATA				
ART UNIT 2436		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/23/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@HUFFMANLAW.NET

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,983

Applicant(s)

HENRY ET AL.

Examiner

FATOUMATA TRAORE

Art Unit

2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/02/2009 has been entered.

Claims Status

2. Claims 1, 6, 8, 17, 20, 22 and 23 have been amended. Claims 7, 16, 21, and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-25 are pending and have been considered below.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 56, 57, 59, 84-87 of US Patent No. 7,321,910 contain(s) every element of claims 1-3, 5, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).
5. Claims 1-4, 9, 11-17 and 25 of US Patent No. 7,502,943 contain(s) every element of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 14, 15 and 22 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).
6. Claims 1, 4, 21-25, and 27- 29 of US Patent No. 7,532,722 contain(s) every element of claims 1-4, 7-15, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).
7. Claims 1-4, 8-14 of Application No. 10,800,983 contain(s) every element of claims 1-5, 8-12, 14 and 15, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).
8. Claims 1-5, 21-25, 27-29 of Application No. 10,806,564 contain(s) every element of claims 1-4, 7-15, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).
9. Claims 1-3, 7, 10-16 of US Patent No. 7,519,833 contain(s) every element of claims 1-4, 7-15, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).

10. Claims 1-4, 11-17 of Application No.11,090690 contain(s) every element of claims 1-4, 7-15, 22 and 25 of the instant application and as such are not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim(s).

11. “A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus).” ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

12. “Claims 12-17 are generic to the species of invention covered by claim 3 of the patent. Thus, the generic invention is “anticipated” by the species of the patented invention. Cf., Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (holding that an earlier species disclosure in the prior art defeats any generic claim). This court’s predecessor has held that, without a terminal disclaimer, the species claims preclude issuance of the generic application. In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 944, 214 USPQ 761, 767 (CCPA 1982); Schneller, 397 F.2d at 354. Accordingly, absent a terminal disclaimer, claims 12 and 13 were properly rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting” (In re Goodman (CA FC) 29 USPQ2d 2010 (12/3/1993).

Response to Arguments

13. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., an X86 integer unit, an X86 floating point unit, X86 MMX unit, X86 SSE unit) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

14. Applicant argues, "If the security operations taught by Kessler were to be performed by a host processor, it would thus defeat his stated purpose, which is to offload tasks from the host processor." This argument is not persuasive because cited portions of Kessler (Col. 1, line 66 - Col. 2, line 39) do not suggest that the purpose of Kessler's invention is to "offload tasks from the host processor." Instead, Applicant has merely pointed to the background of the invention where Kessler describes the use of coprocessors.

15. Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose a "single atomic cryptographic instruction". The examiner has provided a new ground of rejection to address the amended claims language. Christie et al US 7,165,135 single atomic cryptographic instruction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-20, 22-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler et al (US 6,789,147) in view of Christie et al (US 7,165,135).

Claims 1, 17 and 22: Kessler et al disclose an apparatus and a method for performing cryptographic operations, comprising:

An X86-compatible microprocessor, comprising:

- i. An instruction register within a x86-compatible microprocessor (Fig. 1, item 10) having a single atomic cryptographic instruction disposed therein, wherein said single, atomic cryptographic instruction is arranged according to the instruction format for execution on said x86-compatible microprocessor, (*column 3, lines 40-45*) and wherein said single, atomic cryptographic instruction is part of an application program, and wherein said x86-compatible microprocessor executes said application program, and wherein said single, atomic cryptographic instruction prescribes one of the cryptographic operations, and wherein said cryptographic instruction prescribes that a user-generated key schedule be employed for execution of said one of the cryptographic operations (*the execution units include a plurality of operation blocks that correspond to different cryptographic operations that are used depending upon the type of instruction received in the execution queue. The operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES, and RC4*) (*column 9, lines 8-42; Fig. 8*);

- ii. A keygen unit, operatively coupled to said instruction register, configured to direct said x86-compatible microprocessor to load said user-generated key schedule (*column 12, lines 7-40*); and
- iii. An execution unit, operatively coupled to said keygen unit, configured to employ said user-generated key schedule to execute said one of the cryptographic operations (*column 9, lines 7-43*), said execution unit comprising:

A cryptography unit, configured execute a plurality of cryptographic rounds on each of a plurality of input text blocks to generate a corresponding each of a plurality of output text blocks, wherein said plurality of cryptographic rounds are prescribed by a control word that is provided to said *cryptography unit* (*The primitive security operation blocks include an Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) block 807, a Triple Data Encryption Standard (3DES) block 809, a modular exponentiation block 811, a hash block 813, a simple arithmetic and logic block 815, and an alleged RC4.RTM. block 819*) (*column 9, lines 8-22*).

Kessler et al do not explicitly specify wherein said cryptographic instruction is part of an application program, and wherein said x86-compatible microprocessor executes said application program. However Christie et al disclose an apparatus and method, which further disclose wherein said single, atomic cryptographic instruction is part of an application program, and wherein said x86-compatible microprocessor executes said application program(*column 6, lines 38-53; column 7, lines 11 -22*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the teaching of Kessler et al such as to use the x86-compatible microprocessor to execute the actual application program. The motivation of doing so would have been in order to control interrupts in a secure execution mode capable processor as taught by Christie et al (abstract).

Claim 2: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus for performing cryptographic operation as in claim 1 above, and Kessler et al further disclose wherein said one of the cryptographic operations further comprises:

An encryption operation, said encryption operation comprising encryption of a plurality of plaintext blocks to generate a corresponding plurality of ciphertext blocks(*step of performing cryptographic operations such encrypt operation and the decrypt operation*) (column 7, line 54 to column 8, line10; Fig. 5 and Fig. 8).

Claim 3: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus for performing cryptographic operation as in claim 1 above, and further Kessler et al disclose wherein said one of the cryptographic operations further comprises:

A decryption operation, said decryption operation comprising decryption of a plurality of ciphertext blocks to generate a corresponding plurality of plaintext blocks (*step of performing cryptographic operations such encrypt operation and the decrypt operation*) (column 7, line 54 to column 8, line10; Fig. 5 and Fig. 8).

Claims 4, 18 and 24: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus and a method for performing cryptographic operation as in claims 1, 17 and 22 above, and Kessler et al further discloses , wherein said user-generated key schedule is stored in memory(Fig. 2).

Claims 5, 19 and 25: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus and method for performing cryptographic operation as in claims 1, 17 and 22 above, and Kessler et al further disclose, wherein said user-generated key schedule comprises an expanded key schedule according to the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) algorithm (*the operation blocks correspond to cryptographic algorithms such as AES, 3DES, DES and RC4*)(Fig. 8).

Claims 6, 20 and 23: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus and a method as in claims 1, 17 and 22 above, and Kessler et al further disclose that said keygen unit is configured to interpret a key generation field within a control word, which is referenced by said cryptographic instruction (*column 12, lines 7-33*).

Claim 8: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus as in claim 1 above and Kessler et al further disclose that said cryptographic instruction implicitly references a plurality of registers within said x86-compatible microprocessor (*execution unit*) (*column 9, lines 18-40; Fig. 8*).

Claims 9-11: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus as in claim 8 above, and Kessler et al further disclose that said cryptographic instruction implicitly references a plurality of registers, which include a first register, wherein contents of said first register comprise a first pointer to a first memory address, said first memory address specifying a first location in memory for access of a plurality of input text blocks upon which said one of the cryptographic operations is to be accomplished ; and a second register wherein contents of said second register comprise a second pointer to a second memory address, said second memory address specifying a second location in said

memory for storage of a corresponding plurality of output text blocks, said corresponding plurality of output text blocks being generated as a result of accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations upon a plurality of input text blocks said third register indicate a number of text blocks within a plurality of input text blocks (*each execution unit includes a register file block that includes data to be operated on by the corresponding cryptographic algorithm*) (column 9, lines 18-40; Fig. 8).

Claim 12: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus as in claim 8 above, and further Kessler et al further disclose that said plurality of registers comprises a fourth register, wherein contents of said fourth register comprise a third pointer to a third memory address, said third memory address specifying a third location in memory for access of cryptographic key data for use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations (column 9, lines 18-40; Fig. 5 and Fig. 8).

Claim 13: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus and a method as in claim 8 above, and Kessler et al further disclose that said user-generated cryptographic key schedule comprises said cryptographic key data (column 12, lines 8-32).

Claim 14: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus as in claim 8 above, and Kessler et al further disclose that said plurality of registers comprises a fifth register, wherein contents of said fifth register comprise a fourth pointer to a fourth memory address, said fourth memory address specifying a fourth location in memory, said fourth location comprising said initialization vector location, contents of said initialization vector location comprising an initialization vector or initialization vector equivalent for

use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations(*cryptographic operation such as RC4*) (column 9, lines 18-40; Fig. 5 and Fig. 8).

Claim 15: Kessler et al and Christie et al disclose an apparatus as in claim 8 above, and Kessler et al further disclose that said plurality of registers comprises a sixth register, wherein contents of said sixth register comprise a fifth pointer to a fifth memory address, said fifth memory address specifying a fifth location in memory for access of a control word for use in accomplishing said one of the cryptographic operations, wherein said control word prescribes cryptographic parameters for said one of the cryptographic operations, and wherein said control word comprises: a key size field ($nk = \text{key size}$), configured to specify said one of a plurality of cryptographic key sizes to be employed during execution of said one of the cryptographic operations(*cryptographic operation such as RC4*) (column 9, lines 18-40; Fig. 5 and Fig. 8). The examiner notes that it is inherent for the control word to be stored in memory because the key expansion block uses it for generating a round key.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatoumata Traore whose telephone number is (571) 270-1685. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and every other Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nassar G. Moazzami, can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or Informal faxes,

Art Unit: 2436

which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2685.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Friday, July 17, 2009.

/F. T./

Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436